



PLANNING PROCESS CHANGES

June 2005





Planning Process Changes

- Report Summary (EC 1105-2-405)
- DE presentations of decision documents (EC 1105-2-406)
- Planning Models Improvement Program (EC 1105-2-407)
- Peer Review – (EC 1105-2-408)
- Collaborative Planning – EC 1105-2-409)



Summary Report

EC 1105-2-405

- Division Engineers Notice Eliminated
- DE Transmittal Letter - New
- Report Summary - New (no more than 10 pages)
 - Summary of key facts, issues, and uncertainties
 - Consistent format across studies
 - Includes how recommendation supports EOP, integrates with other watershed purposes
 - Serves as basis for DE Briefing and for preparation of final Chiefs Report



District Engineer Presentations

EC 1105-2-406

- Process:
 - DE to brief CW Review Board
 - ◆ Dep Cdr – Corps of Engineers
 - ◆ DCW
 - ◆ HQUSACE Planning Chief
 - ◆ RIT Leader (not from presenting MSC)
 - ◆ Chief Eng, RE, or OPs
- Purpose:
 - Additional accountability for quality of decision documents
 - Ensure issues have been resolved prior to State and Agency review
- Briefing content:
 - Overview of the Report
 - Plan selection recommendation & rationale
 - ITR & policy comments & resolution
 - Public involvement process, issues, resolution



District Engineer Presentations

EC 1105-2-406

MSC Commander Briefing

- Rational For Issuing DE Endorsement Letter
- Certification of Legal and Policy Compliance
- Expected Response to Report
- Other Observations



Planning Models Improvement Program EC 1105-2-407

- PMIP is a 2003 DCW directive to review, improve and validate analytical tools & models for USACE CW business lines
- Establishes process to certify planning models based on peer support and peer review
- IWR and Planning Centers of Expertise will work with HQ on prioritization and implementation
- Result will be Corporate Toolbox of certified Planning models



Peer Review

EC 1105-2-408

Purpose

- To “ensure the quality and credibility of the [Corps] scientific information”
- Closely follows Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review by the Office of Management and Budget 2005
 - “OMB Bulletin”



Peer Review

Applicability

- All studies & reports needing authorization
 - cost sharing agreement not yet signed
- Does not apply to documents approved by MSC commander (CAP, post-auth, etc)
 - May apply if vertical teams finds it appropriate
- Only to scientific / technical information – not policy or project recommendations
 - Factual inputs (data, assumptions, analyses)
 - Use of models (models themselves subject to separate peer review process)



Peer Review

Process Changes

- Independent Technical Review (ITR)
 - Ongoing; not by those doing the work
 - Conforms with professional principles and practices
- Peer Review
 - Includes fundamental principles of ITR
 - Internal (PRI) – Managed by PCX
 - External (PRE) – Managed by PCX



Peer Review – Internal (PRI)

- Not controversial, not precedent setting nor significant national effects
- Draft document available for concurrent public review
- Reviewers are from Corps or outside
- Includes fundamental principles from ITR
- No policy review
- Reviewer prepare report and Center / district respond.
- Review report and responses are posted on Web.
- Chief's report summarizes the review



Peer Review – External (PRE)

- Controversial, precedent setting or has significant national effects
- All the same requirements & procedures from PRI
- Must use from outside the Corps
- High risk studies – Center to contract for management and conduct of PRE



Planning in a Collaborative Environment

EC-1105-2-409

Purpose

- Provide revised procedures for the conduct of Corps water resources planning and the preparation of feasibility (decision) reports
- Fundamentally changing way Corps develops solutions to water resources problems while maintaining existing, effective processes – becoming more relevant to today's National needs and priorities



Background & Policy

- Traditional approach on project specific solutions causes concern
 - NED only
 - Corps interest
 - Amount of time
- More collaborative approach needed to address these concerns



Timeframe for Studies - NEW

- Planning studies (recon through feasibility) will be completed in three years.
 - The level of analysis only needs to be sufficient to provide a viable number of alternatives for decision-making.
- Collaborative, watershed studies may be granted an exception to this requirement.



Federal Interest

- Federal Interest vs. Corps Interest
- Collaborative planning may recommend a watershed plan with Corps' components as well as components to be implemented by other Federal agencies
- Highest budget priority when other Federal agencies participate with funds



Plan Selection

- All planning studies will evaluate, display and compare the full range of alternative plans' effects across all four Principles and Guidelines' accounts.
 - NED, RED, EQ, and Social Effects
- A plan may be a candidate for selection if it has, on balance, net beneficial effects.
- May select and recommend any one of the candidate plans – (ASA(CW) exception needed if not NED or NER plan)
- The basis for selection will consider the beneficial and adverse effects in all four accounts
- Must identify an NED plan (for comparison)



Existing Policy

- Restates existing policy
 - Mitigation
 - Monitoring and Adaptive Management



QUESTIONS ??